

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3

4 ANTHONY L. WILLIAMS,

No. C 11-6653 CW

5 Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR RECUSAL
(Docket No. 7)

6 v.

7 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
LABOR,

8 Defendant.

9
10 Pro se Plaintiff Anthony L. Williams has filed a motion
seeking the recusal of the undersigned in the instant case.

11 Plaintiff seeks recusal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 144 and
12 455(b)(1). Section 455(b)(1) requires a judge to recuse "[w]here
13 he has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, or
14 personal knowledge of disputed evidentiary facts concerning the
15 proceeding." "The test for personal bias or prejudice in section
16 144 is identical to that in section 455(b)(1)." United States v.
17 Sibla, 624 F.2d 864, 867 (9th Cir. 1980).

18 Recusable bias must be both personal and extra-judicial.
19 United States v. Carignan, 600 F.2d 762, 763-64 (9th Cir. 1979).
20 This means that the bias must be "directed against the party" and
21 cannot arise out of judicial acts. Id. The Supreme Court has
22 held, "The alleged bias and prejudice to be disqualifying must
23 stem from an extrajudicial source and result in an opinion on the
24 merits on some basis other than what the judge learned from his
25 participation in the case." United States v. Grinnell Corp., 384
26 U.S. 563, 583 (1966). The source of bias must be extra-judicial
27
28

1 because the recusal statutes were "never intended to enable a
2 discontented litigant to oust a judge because of adverse rulings
3 made, for such rulings are reviewable otherwise." Ex parte
4 American Steel Barrel Co., 230 U.S. 35, 44 (1913).

5 Plaintiff seeks recusal of the undersigned on the basis of
6 her judicial acts, namely her prior rulings against him and her
7 alleged actions in controlling her courtroom and taking notes
8 during a hearing. These are legally insufficient to support a
9 finding of recusable bias. Accordingly, there is no need to refer
10 this recusal request to another judge for decision, and
11 Plaintiff's motion for recusal is DENIED (Docket No. 7).

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13
14 Dated: 4/13/2012


15 CLAUDIA WILKEN
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28